

Estes  
Ezell  
Fallon  
Feenstra  
Ferguson  
Finstad  
Fischbach  
Fitzgerald  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flood  
Flood  
Flood  
Franklin, C.  
Fry  
Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garbarino  
Garcia, Mike  
Gimenez  
Gonzales, Tony  
Good (VA)  
Gooden (TX)  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Greene (GA)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Hageman  
Harris  
Harshbarger  
Hern  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Hinson  
Houchin  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hunt  
Issa  
Jackson (TX)  
James  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Joyce (PA)

Kean (NJ)  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kiggans (VA)  
Kiley  
Kim (CA)  
Kustoff  
LaHood  
LaLota  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Langworthy  
Latta  
LaTurner  
Lawler  
Lee (FL)  
Lesko  
Letlow  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Luna  
Mace  
Malliotakis  
Mann  
Massie  
Mast  
McCaul  
McClain  
McClintock  
McCormick  
McHenry  
Meuser  
Miller (IL)  
Miller (OH)  
Miller (WV)  
Miller-Meeks  
Mills  
Molinaro  
Moolenaar  
Mooney  
Moore (AL)  
Moore (UT)  
Moran  
Murphy  
Nehls  
Newhouse  
Norman  
Nunn (IA)  
Oberholte  
Ogles  
Owens  
Palmer  
Pence

Perry  
Pfluger  
Posey  
Reschenthaler  
Rodgers (WA)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rose  
Rosendale  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Rutherford  
Salazar  
Santos  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Self  
Sessions  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smucker  
Spartz  
Stauber  
Steel  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Steube  
Stewart  
Strong  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiffany  
Timmons  
Turner  
Valadao  
Van Drew  
Van Duyn  
Van Orden  
Walberg  
Waltz  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams (NY)  
Williams (TX)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Yakym  
Zinke

## NOES—203

Adams  
Aguilar  
Allred  
Auchincloss  
Balint  
Barragan  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Bowman  
Boyle (PA)  
Brown  
Brownley  
Budzinski  
Bush  
Caraveo  
Carbajal  
Cardenas  
Carson  
Carter (LA)  
Cartwright  
Casar  
Case  
Casten  
Castor (FL)  
Cherfilus-  
McCormick  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clyburn  
Connolly  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Craig  
Crockett  
Crow

Cuellar  
Davids (KS)  
Davis (IL)  
Dean (PA)  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Deluzio  
DeSaulnier  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Escobar  
Eshoo  
Espallat  
Evans  
Fletcher  
Foster  
Frankel, Lois  
Frost  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia (IL)  
Garcia (TX)  
Garcia, Robert  
Golden (ME)  
Goldman (NY)  
Gomez  
Gonzalez,  
Vicente  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al (TX)  
Grijalva  
Harder (CA)  
Hayes  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Horsford  
Houlihan  
Hoyer  
Hoyle (OR)  
Huffman  
Ivey  
Jackson (IL)

Jackson (NC)  
Jackson Lee  
Jacobs  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Kamlager-Dove  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Khanna  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kim (NJ)  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster  
Landsman  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (NV)  
Lee (PA)  
Leger Fernandez  
Levin  
Lieu  
Lofgren  
Lynch  
Magaziner  
Manning  
Matsui  
McBath  
McClellan  
McCollum  
McGarvey  
McGovern  
Meeks  
Menendez  
Meng  
Mfume  
Moore (WI)  
Morelle  
Moskowitz  
Moulton  
Mrvan  
Mullin

Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neguse  
Norcross  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peltola  
Perez  
Peters  
Pettersen  
Phillips  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Porter  
Pressley  
Quigley  
Ramirez  
Raskin  
Ross

Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan  
Salinas  
Sanchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Scholten  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Sorensen  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Stansbury  
Stanton  
Stevens  
Strickland  
Sykes

Takano  
Thanedar  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tokuda  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres (NY)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood  
Vargas  
Vasquez  
Veasey  
Velazquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Wexton  
Wild  
Williams (GA)  
Wilson (FL)

## NOT VOTING—13

Castro (TX)  
Cleaver  
Cohen  
Davis (NC)  
Ellzey

Foushee  
Kelly (IL)  
Lee (CA)  
Luttrell  
Nickel

Scott, David  
Swalwell  
Wagner

□ 1405

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LUTTRELL. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on rollcall Nos. 165 and 166. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 165 and "nay" on rollcall No. 166.

## LOWER ENERGY COSTS ACT

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 260 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1412

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to lower energy costs by increasing American energy production, exports, infrastructure, and critical minerals processing, by promoting transparency, accountability, permitting, and production of American resources, and by improving water quality certification and energy projects, and for other purposes, with Mr. ISSA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 7 hours, with 6 hours equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees of Energy and Commerce and Natural Resources or their respective designees and 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees.

The gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAL-LONE) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 90 minutes. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas, (Mr. WESTERMAN.)

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

As an engineer, I have learned that no issue is too difficult for American innovation and ingenuity to solve when we honestly identify the problem, develop a sound plan to solve it, and do the hard work to get the results we desire.

The truth we all know is America has an energy crisis. Energy is foundational to everything we do, and for the sake of our future, we must solve this problem.

Energy prices, in general, have gone up nearly 40 percent in a little over 2 years. High energy costs translate throughout the economy, causing inflated prices for every necessity of life, from the food we eat to the clothes we wear to the roof over our heads.

President Biden has said he is working to lower these costs. But his actions are drowning out his words. He has waged war on American producers, shutting down oil and gas leasing, banning mining development in certain areas, and insisting on keeping our Federal regulations permanently stuck in the past.

□ 1415

What are we getting in return?

We are getting more dependence on the worst polluters in the world while we wreck our own economy sending our wealth and jobs overseas.

Our current energy policies favor Putin, the Chinese Communist Party, and despots around the globe over the American people and freedom. Why would our friends across the aisle continue to put the worst polluters, human rights violators, and those who wish us harm above the American people?

No more. H.R. 1 is designed to solve our energy crisis. House Republicans are ready to show the world that American energy—not Saudi Arabian, not Venezuelan, not Chinese, or Russian energy—American energy is our future. American mining, American innovation, American processing and refining,

American manufacturing, and American infrastructure will lead us out of this energy crisis.

H.R. 1 outlines this through a variety of measures. First, it rolls back the Biden administration's oil and gas leasing moratoriums, giving producers certainty to produce resources safely and responsibly right here at home.

Next, given the importance of minerals to our national security, clean energy technology, and a host of everyday uses, H.R. 1 shores up domestic supply chains for commodities like copper, lithium, and cobalt, and allows us to make our energy infrastructure where it should be made—right here at home in the United States.

Every ounce we produce here is an ounce less we and our allies are forced to purchase from Chinese-controlled mines with deplorable labor and environmental standards. And, of course, none of this is possible without modernizing the Federal regulations that delay the projects we desperately need.

If you don't believe permitting reform is needed, maybe you will believe President Biden's senior adviser, John Podesta, who recently said: "We can move faster by setting tighter deadlines for agencies to complete environmental reviews. We can move smarter by making it easier to approve projects with low environmental impact . . . But Congress needs to do its job . . . So it is time to get back to work and pass permitting reform legislation."

We are called to be good stewards of our resources and leave them better than we found them. That is the definition of conservation. We cannot say our global resources are better off today under Democratic policies. China is building coal plants at a rapid pace, using slave labor to construct solar panels and develop critical minerals, while Russia is not only one of the worst environmental catastrophes on the planet, but they are also using their energy revenues to fund their war in Ukraine.

We cannot continue to turn a blind eye to these injustices and say, "not in my backyard." America drills, mines, builds, and innovates cleaner, safer, and more responsibly than anywhere else in the world.

Before American innovators and workers can solve our energy problems, we need a plan. H.R. 1 is the plan to solve our energy crisis.

For these and many more reasons, I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Lower Energy Costs Act. H.R. 1 is the blueprint to ease the burden of this self-inflicted energy crisis on American families.

H.R. 1, when executed, will make the United States more secure and competitive on the global stage. Ultimately, H.R. 1 will improve the health and longevity of our natural resources, create a better climate, and spur economic growth and jobs—these are results we should all get behind.

Mr. Chair, you don't have to be an engineer to solve this energy problem.

I urge all of my colleagues to join with me and vote a resounding "yes" in support of H.R. 1.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, March 20, 2023.

Hon. BRUCE WESTERMAN,  
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WESTERMAN: I am writing regarding H.R. 1335, the Transparency, Accountability, Permitting, and Production of American Resources Act, which was ordered reported by the Committee on Natural Resources on March 9, 2023.

The bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget. In order to expedite House consideration of H.R. 1335, the Committee on the Budget will forgo action on this bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in H.R. 1335 or similar legislation and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that the Committee may address any remaining issues that fall within its jurisdiction. The Committee on the Budget also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation and requests your support of any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1335 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in your committee report and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during floor consideration of H.R. 1335.

Sincerely,

JODEY C. ARRINGTON,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,  
Washington, DC, March 21, 2023.

Hon. JODEY C. ARRINGTON,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ARRINGTON: I write regarding H.R. 1335, the Transparency, Accountability, Permitting, and Production of American Resources Act, which was ordered reported by the Committee on Natural Resources on March 9, 2023.

I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget and appreciate your willingness to forgo action on the bill. I acknowledge that the Budget Committee will not formally consider H.R. 1335 and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained therein.

I am pleased to support your request to name members of the Committee on the Budget to any conference committee to consider such provisions. I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Committee Report for H.R. 1335 and the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation.

Sincerely,

BRUCE WESTERMAN,  
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, DC, March 24, 2023.

Hon. BRUCE WESTERMAN,  
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter confirms our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1335, the "TAPP American Resources Act". Thank you for collaborating with the Committee on Agriculture on the matters within our jurisdiction.

The Committee on Agriculture will forego any further consideration of this bill. However, by foregoing consideration at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over any subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. The Committee on Agriculture also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees should it become necessary and ask that you support such a request.

We would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1355, and request a copy of our letters on this matter be published in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

GLENN "GT" THOMPSON,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,  
Washington, DC, March 25, 2023.

Hon. GLENN "GT" THOMPSON,  
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write regarding H.R. 1335, the Transparency, Accountability, Permitting, and Production of American Resources Act, which was ordered reported by the Committee on Natural Resources on March 9, 2023.

I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and appreciate your willingness to forgo action on the bill. I acknowledge that the Committee on Agriculture will not formally consider H.R. 1335 and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained therein.

I am pleased to support your request to name members of the Committee on Agriculture to any conference committee to consider such provisions. I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation.

Sincerely,

BRUCE WESTERMAN,  
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, today I rise in urgent opposition to the Republicans' H.R. 1.

Last week, the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change issued its final report. Their message couldn't be clearer. We have a lot to do and very little time to do it before the ticking climate bomb we are living in goes off.

I want to emphasize that their message wasn't one of complete despair. There is hope. The hope hinges on two major conditions.

One, we must stop burning fossil fuels, the number one cause of climate change. And two, we must transform our energy system to a cleaner and more sustainable one now.

H.R. 1, the bill before us today, which has earned the fitting title of polluters over people act, will actively and aggressively take us backwards on both those accounts.

Looking more like a nearly 200-page love letter to polluting industries than a serious legislative effort, the polluters over people act is a laundry list of gifts and giveaways to polluting industries.

Let's look at what it does for Big Oil. For example, last year companies shattered profit records across the board by price gouging working Americans at the pump while also hoarding thousands of unused leases on our public lands and waters.

Rather than hold Big Oil accountable for this abuse, the polluters over people act lowers royalty rates, repeals interest fees, reinstates noncompetitive leasing, and forces Federal agencies to hold rock-bottom lease sales all but assuring that last year's profit records will soon be broken again.

Never to be outdone, the mining industry gets its fair share of gifts in H.R. 1, as well. Mining companies, many of which are foreign-owned, already enjoy a free-for-all on our public lands. They make a mockery of Tribal consultation, destroy sacred and special places, ruin the landscape, and leave behind a toxic mess that pollutes our water and hurts our health—all without paying a cent to the American people—not one red cent is paid in royalties.

Now included in this package is that they can use the public land for anything they want, including dumping of toxic mineral waste.

There is more, but suffice it to say, with all these handouts, it comes as no surprise that the Congressional Budget Office just reported last week that H.R. 1 will actually increase the Federal deficit.

Staying true to its name, the polluters over people act also fast-tracks dirty energy projects by gutting our bedrock environmental and public health laws; namely, the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA.

This is not in a new so-called permitting reform solution they have come up with to address our energy needs. This is the same ideological attack I have seen Republicans in the Natural Resources Committee launch on NEPA year after year after year.

For anyone who is being lured into thinking there are opportunities for negotiations on this bill—do not be naive. This performative permitting reform is not a bipartisan solution, not even a starting point for one.

This is just another decades-old request from polluters to make their operations cheaper and easier, while making Americans' lives harder and more costly.

It is not a serious solution to any of our energy goals. Even former President George W. Bush's head of permitting efforts has said that this bill will be "of no statistically significant consequence."

In fact, the polluters over people act has none of the real permitting solutions that can speed up the build-out of the clean energy infrastructure that we all need.

One of those solutions would be increasing funding for Federal permitting offices, which is exactly what Democrats did when they secured more than \$1 billion in last year's historic Inflation Reduction Act. Even Republicans' own witness at a hearing called that money "wonderful." No more funding is in H.R. 1.

Another solution for speeding up clean energy development is reforming the planning and cost allocation process for electrical transmission lines that can carry renewable energy from different sources across the country. But, no, you are not going to see that in H.R. 1 either.

Of course, any real permitting reform solutions would make sure to protect and empower the communities that have been disproportionately hurt by dirty energy and other polluters for decades—and that are now being hit the hardest by climate change as well.

As you can probably guess, H.R. 1 doesn't just fail to protect these communities, it silences them further, laying them bare to even more devastation, harm, and exploitation.

The polluters over people act isn't just an embarrassment of riches for polluting industries, it is an embarrassment to our communities, to our climate goals, and to this legislative body.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, this utopian idea of having our cake and eating it too, the "not in my backyard" mentality, it just won't work for the economy or the environment. That is why we need change.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, someone who knows the importance of energy to production agriculture.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

Let me be clear, a vote for H.R. 1 is a vote for food security. Let me repeat that. A vote for H.R. 1 is a vote for food security.

Let me explain. As chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, and proud Representative from Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District, I am no stranger to the challenges facing America's energy industry and its direct impact on farming communities.

In fact, the Commonwealth showcases the nexus between energy and agriculture production each and every day.

Pennsylvania is home to abundant natural resources from Marcellus shale natural gas play to America's first commercial oil well. These are responsibly developed resources that have provided energy affordability to our

Nation for generations and transformed the U.S. into a global economic powerhouse.

These resources have also helped spur our State's largest industry—agriculture. And just like any other region of the country, the viability of our ag sector is relying upon access to abundant and affordable energy.

By gambling away American energy independence and domestic oil and gas production in the name of climate change, the Biden administration has harmed the very industry—U.S. agriculture—that contributes to 13 percent of our annual greenhouse gas sequestration.

The hardworking men and women who feed and fuel our Nation in the world are, in reality, climate heroes.

Even still, this administration has continued to take irrational regulatory and policy actions that foster uncertainty and limit our ability to meet the food, fiber, and energy demands of our Nation and the world.

This legislation provides a reprieve for America's families, including our farmers, ranchers, and foresters, who have struggled with fractured supply chains, skyrocketing input costs, and historic levels of inflation, all of which are exacerbated by excessive spending and regulatory overreach from Washington.

American agriculture, if given the right tools and regulatory certainty, can serve a vital role in alleviating global food instability and mitigating costs for consumers.

H.R. 1 provides this certainty and will deliver long-lasting relief for nearly every sector of the U.S. economy.

As I have always said, food security is national security. We need dependable local power generation, adequate infrastructure, a strong workforce, and lower energy costs for farm operations to remain viable. It is time we return to embracing American energy, not abandon it, and in doing so, enable America's agriculture sector to thrive.

House Republicans made a commitment to an economy that is strong. Through H.R. 1, we are upholding that promise.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, we heard the term NIMBY thrown around to describe opposition to this bill. This NIMBY term, not in my backyard, is used to describe local residents, oftentimes very wealthy residents, who oppose development in their neighborhoods, but unfortunately support development of it elsewhere.

This NIMBY term is being used by some to try to discredit opposition to this bill. In reality, the groundswell of opposition of this bill comes from places that look like places behind me, not Martha's Vineyard—places like Cancer Alley along the Gulf Coast, and many other environmental justice communities across the country that millions upon millions of American call home.

Make no mistake, the greatest consequences from pollution giveaways in

H.R. 1 will fall on places like the ones in this photograph that are already overburdened by industries' pollution.

Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to this legislation. First, I thank the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee for yielding.

Climate change is an existential threat to the United States and the world. Without action to reduce emissions, the damage to our Nation, economy, and future generations will be immeasurable.

Americans understand the severity of this moment. That is why polling shows that most Americans want to prioritize the development of alternative energy sources over expanding the production of fossil fuels.

□ 1430

The bill before us today will do the exact opposite. H.R. 1, the polluters over people act, is a brazen giveaway to the oil, gas, and mining industries.

As Big Oil reaps record profits thanks to billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies, this bill will rubberstamp the construction of new natural gas pipelines and shut government agencies out of the review process.

H.R. 1 will also mandate the auctioning of our public lands for oil and gas leases, make it easier to export liquefied natural gas to foreign adversaries, and allow oil companies to price gouge working families.

This bill effectively gives energy companies a license to pollute. Simply put, it is a disaster for our environment and our fight against climate change.

Americans do not want energy policy to come at the expense of public health. Many of my constituents have suffered for years from air pollution emitted from a local plant that runs on burning natural gas and fuel oil. This pollution has resulted in generations of families developing asthma in what is colloquially known as asthma alley.

H.R. 1 will encourage this dangerous pollution in communities across the country. That is why I have submitted two amendments. One will protect these at-risk localities by removing restrictions preventing individuals from suing in response to a violation of NEPA if they bring a claim related to protecting public health. My second amendment would require publicly traded companies to disclose their goals and actions related to greenhouse gas emissions and meeting the goals of the Paris climate accord.

These amendments were rejected by the Rules Committee, as were over 90 percent of the amendments proposed by my Democratic colleagues. So much for the open amendment process Republicans promised when they took over the majority.

H.R. 1 is a reckless bill that empowers polluters to boost profits for Republicans' industry friends.

Last year, Democrats acted to lower energy costs for working families and weaken our dependence on fossil fuels by passing the Inflation Reduction Act. The IRA was the largest-ever investment in fighting climate change while creating thousands of good-paying jobs, attracting billions of dollars in investment, and lowering the average American family's energy costs by about \$1,800 a year.

H.R. 1 seeks to reverse the progress we have made since passing the IRA. Mr. Chairman, this bill will take us backward both economically and environmentally, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, the rhetoric is just not matching the reality. The reality is that current energy policies are forcing us to buy energy and minerals from the worst polluters on the Earth. Not only are they the worst polluters; they are the worst human rights violators.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER), who serves on the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman WESTERMAN for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am honored to support H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act, to increase energy production, export American energy, and build out our infrastructure to transport it.

All of our constituents have seen and felt the impact of the constraint on and the cost of energy. Sadly, we don't have to go too far to see the impact of this administration's efforts to harm domestically produced energy.

From the cancelation of the Keystone XL pipeline, a moratorium of oil and gas leases on Federal lands, and the self-destruction of our offshore lease programs, it is hard to imagine just how far this administration will go to prop up unrealistic, utopian ideas—utopian ideas that a country could solely exist on wind and solar without oil and gas.

By the way, there is a whole lot of information on wind and solar that doesn't get advertised all that much: the fact that the materials necessary to build those components come from mining that we have largely prevented ourselves from doing and have to import from overseas, the cost of the transmission, and the fact that those rotors on the wind turbines need fossil fuels to continue to operate. Nevertheless, that is the evangelism we have been given by the current administration.

Americans are paying the price for this utopian future, and they are paying it right now. With this just transition to other forms of unreliable energy, the cost is borne by the most vulnerable among us.

That is why Republicans are leading the way to unleash the full potential of

American energy through H.R. 1. H.R. 1 means no more begging the Saudis for oil, ignoring the humanitarian crisis in Venezuela, and forgoing American workers, industry, and expertise.

H.R. 1 means abundant energy for all Americans in an environmentally responsible way.

Republicans are also leading the way with all forms of energy. That is why I am thankful for the inclusion of my CLEAN Act in H.R. 1 to promote the responsible exploration of geothermal resources on Federal lands.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman WESTERMAN for his leadership, and I look forward to the passage of H.R. 1.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the polluters over people act.

Protecting our environment is foundational to the heritage, culture, and quality of life that we enjoy in the Pacific Northwest. We are trailblazers in clean, renewable energy sources like hydroelectric, wind, and solar.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle should follow our lead and focus on accelerating our transition toward a green energy economy like Democrats did in the Inflation Reduction Act. Instead, Republicans are pushing a messaging bill loaded with giveaways to the fossil fuel industry that will blow a \$2.4 billion hole in our deficit.

This legislation not only does nothing to lower energy costs, but it raises prices for families by repealing Inflation Reduction Act discounts for energy-saving home appliances.

I offered an amendment to this bill, with the support of every Democrat from the Washington and Oregon delegations, that would prevent oil and gas companies from drilling along the Washington and Oregon coasts. The last thing any of us want is the next Deepwater Horizon spill on our shores. This was rejected by the majority. An open amendment process apparently only applies to Republicans.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), who is another member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support today of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

Since coming into office, the Biden administration has taken steps to depress domestic energy production, causing prices to skyrocket and making America reliant on our adversaries for energy.

From heating our homes to filling our gas tanks, Americans have been burdened with historically high energy prices. With growing global demand predicted year after year, we must pass laws that will make America energy independent.

H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act, is crucial in restarting our onshore and offshore leasing program. It also incentivizes the production of domestic minerals that are essential for national security and sustainable energy projects.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about all this electrification.

Mr. Chairman, do you know what needs electrification? Copper.

Do you know what the other side has done? They have started to ban copper mines.

I don't know how you make this happen unless, I guess, they want us to buy copper from China. It makes sense to me: Buy copper from China and be reliant on people who don't like us.

You can see the production here, Mr. Chairman. Look at Chinese copper production. Look at United States copper production.

I know what the other side wants. They want us to be reliant on China.

Modernizing our Federal regulations needs to happen so we prevent projects from being in endless litigation.

Mr. Chairman, let's do the things that are sustainable and necessary for our economy and that are necessary to making sure that we are energy independent.

H.R. 1 incentivizes an all-of-the-above energy approach. This legislation promotes domestic sources of materials critical to renewable energy while maintaining robust environmental standards.

American energy is the cleanest in the world. We can and we must produce our own energy in an efficient, clean, and safe way for Americans. We can do that.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 1 to eliminate red tape and promote affordable domestic energy production.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, let me remind my colleagues that this bill provides more handouts to foreign mining companies with terrible environmental and human rights records.

For example, Rio Tinto, a foreign-owned mining company, is preparing for a new copper mine in Arizona at a sacred site, Oak Flat. In 2020, the company knowingly and needlessly demolished a 46,000-year-old sacred Australian aboriginal site, an irreplaceable cultural artifact, to expand an iron mine.

This bill rolls out the welcome mat for even more mining by foreign-controlled companies with records of human rights violations, cultural desecration, and pollution.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN), who is a valued member of our committee.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1, the polluters over people act.

Although energy independence and lower costs are laudable goals for any energy legislation, unfortunately, this

bill achieves neither. Instead, H.R. 1 is a giveaway to Big Oil and their lobbyists, who want to be able to set their own rules at the expense of working families. Instead of putting the needs of the American public at the center of this bill, my friends across the aisle drafted an industry wish list.

First, H.R. 1 undermines landmark environmental laws and protections like the Clean Water Act and the National Environmental Policy Act that safeguard public health and keep our drinking water and air clean. It also repeals the methane emissions reduction program, which helps companies reduce their methane pollution.

This bill makes it easier for polluters to set their own standards and roll back reforms, and it lets Big Oil rubberstamp their own projects with minimal oversight. Environmental disasters are far too common, and unfortunately, H.R. 1 would make it easier for future disasters to happen.

Second, the polluters over people act worsens the climate crisis by empowering the fossil fuel industry instead of strengthening the foundation for a clean energy future, which is so important.

During the last Congress, the 117th Congress, we passed policies—many bipartisan policies—like the bipartisan infrastructure law, the CHIPS and Science Act, and the Inflation Reduction Act, that invested in climate action at a scale matching the challenge that science tells us that we face.

This bill that we have before us today not only ignores the additional steps we need to take to reach our climate targets, but it actively takes us backward on climate action by rolling back key provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act, which was and is the most significant environmental and climate bill that has ever been passed in the United States or anywhere else.

We know that data is alarming. A new U.N. report found that global warming could increase by 3.2 degrees Celsius and cause 7 feet of sea level rise by the end of the century if immediate actions are not taken. This is an existential crisis.

Climate change is real. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle know it is real, and we cannot continue to deny this and put our planet at risk with this type of legislation.

Instead of wasting time on this Big Oil wish list, I would like for us, instead, to focus on actions that will actually expand the employment of clean energy, reduce costs, expand high-capacity transmission, reform the interconnection process, and build on the \$1 billion that we secured in the Inflation Reduction Act to ensure that Federal agencies have the resources and expertise to conduct efficient environmental reviews.

□ 1445

Third, H.R. 1 adds to the deficit. That is right, it adds to the deficit by giving handouts to big oil and gas corpora-

tions so that their executives and their shareholders can get even richer.

For a party that is focused—at least, I hear that they are—on tackling the deficit, I think it is pretty extraordinary that this legislation, their signature legislation would add to the deficit.

Last year, when Americans were dealing with high costs at the pump, fossil fuel executives were taking in record profits. In fact, 26 of the country's largest oil companies made a record-breaking \$451 billion last year, just last year, and they spent over \$163 billion on stock buybacks and dividends to their shareholders.

These same companies donated over \$370,000 to my friends across the aisle, so it is no wonder they want to reward their friends. It is clear that this legislation, the polluters over people act, is another giveaway, to keep corporations rich at the American people's expense without making meaningful reforms. In fact, while making things worse. For all these reasons and more, I strongly oppose this legislation.

Mr. Chair, I proposed four amendments that would begin to correct course, but unfortunately my friends across the aisle are only allowing two of those amendments to come to the floor.

My first amendment that was blocked would clarify that lead Federal agencies can extend a public comment period or gather further community input if the Secretary determines that doing so would improve project results or efficiency.

This would allow agencies to actually streamline the permitting process by ensuring that potentially impacted communities and local governments have the ability to fully engage in the process.

Instead, my friends across the aisle chose to block consideration of this amendment and perpetuate the myth—it is a myth—that community input somehow slows down project approvals.

My other amendment that was blocked would have banned offshore drilling off the southern California coast. Californians of both political parties have made it absolutely clear, overwhelmingly clear that they are strongly opposed to additional offshore oil and gas drilling in southern California off the coast.

This amendment would have offered this Congress an opportunity to respect the will of the overwhelming majority of Californians who oppose drilling off our coasts.

I strongly urge my friends across the aisle, allow debate on these and other amendments so that more voices are heard.

As my colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee have heard me say before, I am willing to work with anyone—anyone—on either side of the aisle to meet the goals of lowering energy costs and protecting our planet, particularly in terms of promoting a more efficient and transparent permitting process. I hope we can do that.

We can find common ground on pragmatic solutions. This is not common ground. I encourage my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I heard the word "rich" mentioned a few times. I will tell you what is rich is when our colleagues across the aisle project their energy policies onto our plan. Again, the only polluters who are being put over the people are China, Russia, and Saudi Arabia.

Talk about big oil company profits, I read where Aramco, a Saudi company, had record profits last year, \$161 billion in profits. I believe that is the country that President Biden went to and asked them to increase production because we weren't making enough at home.

Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), the chair of the Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee.

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Chair, before I begin my speech, I just want to tell the American people, you are not hearing all the truth on this. Sometimes my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will try to repeat things, mislead the American people. It is rinse, lather, repeat. The American people are smarter than that.

H.R. 1 is a priority for this Conference. It helps to modernize the permitting process.

Madam Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1, Majority Leader Scalise's Lower Energy Costs Act, a bill I am an original cosponsor of, helped to write, and a bill America needs now more than ever.

I am also pleased that the House Natural Resources Committee received primary jurisdiction. I thank the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Transportation and Infrastructure for their important contributions as well.

Americans put Republicans in control of the House, in part, because we campaigned on making life more affordable and making it easier to build. We want to let miners mine, farmers farm, builders build, and let small businesses succeed. However, under today's permitting scheme, that is all but impossible.

In the district I represent, we have a proposed mine that would provide a huge resource of copper, nickel, cobalt, a huge resource of those critical minerals that we need, and it is on year 20 of permitting and litigation. It has a signed project labor agreement, committed to domestic union labor for the mine's construction.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle at every turn reject that mine as well as this administration does. This mine has won every lawsuit thrown its way, but further frivolous litigation and endless bureaucracy continue to mire the project year after year. We can help to build the energy transition with domestic minerals mined by Minnesotans, but the permitting bureaucracy stands in the way.

That is why I am proud that my own legislation, which has 33 cosponsors, the Permitting for Mining Needs Act, is included in the base text.

PERMIT-MN creates what miners want. They want certainty. It limits frivolous litigation, puts in place commonsense review timelines, and just puts American miners to work, whether they are in Minnesota, Alaska, Arizona, Nevada, California, or anywhere else.

This is about so much more than mining. If you are at all serious about emissions reduction, you will vote to support H.R. 1.

Why? Because right now, for example, it takes years to decades to permit transmission projects that will add wind and solar to the grid.

At our February 9 oversight hearing on permitting, American Clean Power testified that failure to enact permitting reforms puts an estimated 100 gigawatts of clean energy projects at risk.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. LETLOW). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Chair, that means risking \$100 billion worth of investment and 150,000 potential jobs in the clean energy sector.

In the Natural Resources Committee, we have a real tangible example. At our February 28 legislative hearing on my colleague GARRET GRAVES' BUILDER Act, Dairyland Power testified about the Cardinal-Hickory Creek transmission line. This transmission line, which will put more wind power on the grid, is about 103 miles long, but it is locked in year 7 of permitting.

We need to pass H.R. 1 for energy independence and critical mineral dominance.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is too bad that my Republican colleagues continue to point to Chinese and Russian practices to try to lower the bar for environmental and community protections in our own country. The United States should lead, and we shouldn't set our standards by China or Russia.

The American people want their protections, they want clean energy, and they want the process that allows the American people to know and to participate. This bill does none of that.

Madam Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN).

Mr. CASTEN. Madam Chair, I am going to be honest. I am at a loss for words.

This bill, the polluters over people act, is bad for the consumers, bad for the environment, and bad for the U.S. economy. You wouldn't know that from the rhetoric across the aisle, leaving me to wonder whether they are all lying or just ignorant. I am going to give them the benefit of the doubt here and assume they are ignorant.

Since I am at a loss for words, as I said, I am going to try to explain this with some numbers. Since 2010, the United States economy has grown by \$7 trillion. That is about 50 percent. During the same period, natural gas consumption in our country is up 25 percent, only half as much. Petroleum consumption is flat. Coal consumption is down by 40 percent.

This is awesome news. We should all be celebrating. We have decoupled economic growth from fossil fuel consumption. We can grow without depending on environmental degradation. The environment and American energy consumers are winning. That is not because they are using less energy. It is because they are not paying for it. You don't pay for solar energy. You don't pay for energy efficiency.

Remember, no one wants a barrel of oil. What you want is a cold beer and a hot shower. Now, Americans are getting more of the latter with less of the former, and if that confuses anybody in this body, then I would encourage you to go ask your local 6-year-old, what would you rather have on Christmas morning; a warm fire and some twinkly lights or a big old lump of coal? Like I said, this isn't that complicated.

Let us now ask what the fossil fuel industry has done in the wake of their collapsing market share. Did they pivot to providing things consumers want—cleaner, cheaper energy?

Did they redeploy their capital into solar, wind, geothermal, electric vehicle charging stations?

Of course not. They moved to strip-mine the United States and asked for your acceleration of their work.

During the same period, U.S. exports of oil have grown by a factor of four. U.S. exports of natural gas have grown by a factor of six. Their revenues that Mr. LEVIN talked about are not going up because they are selling more of their product to Americans, it is because they are strip-mining America and selling it overseas.

Exporting U.S. energy does not lower the price of energy in the United States. If anything, it raises costs to American consumers because you reduce domestic supply, for goodness sakes. This bill would only make that worse.

To be sure, there are real challenges facing U.S. energy consumers. We have an aging grid. We need transmission to connect renewables to load. We have got the growth in electric demand thanks to all those EVs and heat pumps. We should be focusing on those challenges if we are looking out for the American consumer, but this bill does not give a damn about the American consumer. Its sole purpose is to transfer wealth from the American taxpayer to American energy exporters.

There are a small number of Americans whose wealth depends on oil and gas production and export—you all know them by name, I am sure—but every single American benefits from cheaper energy, and if you are going to



claim to support the interests of the latter, vote “no” on this bill. If you are voting “yes,” at least have the dignity to be honest about whose interests you are looking out for.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), the senior Republican on the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman, who is doing a great job as chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee, for yielding.

Madam Chair, what should be crystal clear by now is that our friends across the aisle do not have solutions to the energy crisis. For the last 4 years, Democrats have controlled both Chambers of Congress, but in that time, not one single piece of serious legislation was ever introduced which would have lowered the cost of energy. After seeing costs rise for years on end, voters decided that they had had enough and elected Republicans to solve this crisis.

In 2019, a gallon of gas cost just over \$2. Today, it costs almost \$4. The price of groceries has gone up, as the price of energy to ship and keep them cool has gone up as well. Some items have seen as high as a 55 percent increase.

What has been done to help ease energy costs?

What solutions do my friends across the aisle have?

As a result of President Biden’s Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, the United States pumped \$75.8 billion of taxpayer money into unreliable green tech. Besides that, Americans have pumped trillions of both public and private dollars into these industries for decades, but solar and wind combined still only make up 10 percent of American electricity generation.

Instead of making existing technology more affordable, this administration and its allies in Congress dumped billions of dollars into technologies that cannot provide reliable and dispatchable energy to even a fraction of the country. This so-called solution has done nothing to lower costs for the average American. We have higher costs. There is more potential for rolling brownouts. This is the best that my friends across the aisle can do.

An intelligent person would think, why not continue to invest in affordable and proven technology while we are waiting for these alternatives to become viable?

They might be in the future at some point. That is great. But right now it is only 10 percent of our national electrical production.

The PJM Interconnection, for example, which is a grid that services over 65 million people, has announced that they will be short 26 percent of their total energy obligations because radical environmentalists are retiring energy sources while providing no reliable backups.

□ 1500

EPA also recently finalized what they are calling the “Good Neighbor”

rule by denying 26 different State plans to conform to EPA ozone regulations.

This denial means that 26 States, including my State of Colorado, will have sources of energy generation completely shut down while having no viable backup whatsoever.

This decision guarantees that costs and shortages will continue to increase for the American people with no end in sight.

Maintaining affordable energy is crucial to our way of life. It is what keeps water treatment plants open. It is what keeps hospitals open. It is what keeps traffic lights, libraries, schools, trucks, ships, and airplanes operating.

When the cost of powering these essential processes go up, costs go up. If the grid shuts down, everything relying upon it goes down. This will have catastrophic consequences.

Those of us around the country have seen what happens in places like California with its unrealistic energy policies and want nothing to do with it. High prices and shortages come with overregulation.

Let’s face the facts: Current green tech cannot come anywhere close to powering our Nation right now or in the foreseeable future.

The Energy Information Administration expects fossil fuel demand to continue rising, not decreasing, beyond the year 2050.

Ironically, as an aside, fossil fuel industries have always made a higher profit when there is a Democratic President because of the increased per barrel price of oil, but that is just an aside.

Republicans also aren’t neglecting permitting realities by ignoring unused drilling permits. We simply recognize that those permits on their own are insufficient to generate investment and production, especially when this administration is doing everything it can to discourage the producers of conventional energy.

What should be clear in this debate is that Republicans are the ones who know how energy works, and we are passing legislation.

H.R. 1 is serious legislation that will lower costs. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this bill.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, just a reminder. H.R. 1, the polluters over people act, repeals the \$4.5 billion home electrification rebate program designed to lower energy bills for all American families.

Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.)

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Madam Chair, there was some discussion earlier and an allegation made that Democrats have yet to introduce any policy to reduce our energy costs, as if we have completely forgotten about the sweeping, multibillion-dollar investments in the Inflation Reduction Act to reduce people’s costs across the board.

I am rising today to stand in opposition to H.R. 1. While Republicans try

to claim that this is a bill to lower people’s energy costs, what we really see when we start digging into it, is that what this bill actually shows us by the Republican authors is that they actually have no plan to reduce our utility bills or even prevent climate disaster in the United States.

The central argument and logic of this bill is that if you give Big Oil everything they want, then perhaps they will lower our gas prices.

It is a form of trickle-down fantasy that just will not make life easier for everyday Americans. What H.R. 1 will do is give Big Oil more leases of public lands.

This idea that an increased supply of fossil fuels will drive down prices is also mistaken. Let’s look at what happened last year.

We saw how Big Oil more than doubled its profits to \$219 billion, all while price gouging customers at the pump, not because of supply issues but because they can.

Republicans opposed solutions that we put forward, like a windfall tax on price gouging on Big Oil in order to prevent these kinds of behaviors.

Fossil fuel companies, moreover, already have thousands of unused permits on public lands, yet they want even more. This is not a problem of supply. It is a problem of greed and abuse of market power.

I, along with many of my colleagues, called for that windfall tax.

What does this bill do instead?

It is almost as if you gave a pen to an oil lobbyist and wrote down everything that they want. Much of that is in this bill.

We are looking at reducing Big Oil’s royalty rates to the public and slashing interest fees.

For people following at home, if you are a member of the American public, if you are a taxpaying citizen, you are part of the ownership of our public lands.

When an oil company decides to lease that land, they are supposed to pay a royalty to the public.

What does H.R. 1 do?

It slashes that royalty rate so that there is very little payback or investment into the American people and many of our programs.

In this bill, Republicans are squarely on the side of fossil fuel companies. It makes it harder for communities to fight Big Oil when they don’t want them drilling in their own backyards.

It also threatens our public lands and allows anyone to stake a mining claim on our public lands for less than \$10 an acre, even if they haven’t discovered any minerals.

Despite the fact that more than 40 percent of Americans live in counties hit by climate disasters, this bill prohibits agencies from even considering climate change when deciding whether or not to issue a permit to a drilling company.

None of these things are going to lower our costs at the pump. None of

these things are going to actually reduce our utility bills.

In fact, in talking about this allegation of a lack of Democrat proposals, Democrats introduced 95 amendments, proposed 95 amendments to this bill, and the Republican majority rejected all but seven.

I, myself, personally sponsored an amendment in the spirit of this bill, allegedly, to try to reduce prices, and my amendment would have made sure that the subsidies that the Federal Government provides to oil and gas companies actually make their way to the American people—instead of lining the pockets of billionaire CEOs—and actually have the intended effect.

Republicans rejected that amendment, too. They have made clear where they stand. I cannot emphasize enough how detrimental and damaging this bill would be, not only to the climate crisis, not only to the purpose of even trying to reduce our utility costs, but moreover, for the ability for the American people to actually receive an investment on the public lands that they lease out.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, the Inflation Reduction Act that has been referenced here, it did invest in energy companies: energy companies in Saudi Arabia, energy companies in China, and energy companies in places like Russia and Venezuela and Iran at the cost of the American people.

The bill also referred to—outside of the House Chambers—is the climate bill, referred to by my colleagues across the aisle. It did one thing to inflation, it drove inflation up at the cost to the American taxpayer.

Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, everything around us that makes our lives possible is either mined, or it is grown. Everything.

Above the Speaker's chair is a plea from Daniel Webster to those who serve in this House. "Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers . . . and see whether we also, in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

Yet, for 50 years, the environmental left has slowly strangled our Nation's ability to do just that. In the process, it is impoverishing the American people.

One of its most powerful weapons is the National Environmental Policy Act imposed in 1969 with the promise that it would protect the environment.

It has done exactly the opposite. It has made it endlessly time consuming and ultimately cost prohibitive to manage our forests, to provide abundant water for our people, and to prosper from our vast energy and mineral resources.

My district comprises the forests of the Sierra Nevada and the agricultural heartland of California's Central Valley.

The left promised us that NEPA would protect our forests and water resources. Come to my district, and you will see what a cruel and demonstrable lie that has become.

Excess timber is removed from our forests in only two ways. If we don't carry it out, nature will burn it out.

Throughout the 20th century, the U.S. Forest Service marked off surplus timber and auctioned it to logging companies that paid us to remove it.

The result was healthy, resilient, and fire-resistant Federal forests, a steady revenue source for forest improvements, and thriving mountain economies.

Then came the National Environmental Policy Act. Simple forest thinning projects now require an average of 4½ years of environmental studies, costing millions of dollars, more than the value of the timber.

Instead of making money for the government, removing excess timber now costs us money. As a result, our forests have become morbidly overgrown, carrying four times the timber that the land can support.

In that stressed condition, the trees succumb to disease, pestilence, drought, and ultimately catastrophic wildfires we haven't seen in over a century.

California is one of the most water-rich regions of the country. Yet, the farms of the Central Valley have had their water systematically choked off because NEPA and other environmental laws make major new reservoirs all but impossible to build. Record rainfall this year is being lost to the ocean simply because we have no place to store it.

When the little town of Foresthill tried to add a \$2 million spillway gate for additional water storage, they discovered that because of NEPA, they also had to budget an additional \$1 million for environmental reviews and \$2 million for environmental mitigation.

After more than a decade, the project has yet to be built. The last reservoir over a million acre-feet constructed in California was completed in 1979. Meanwhile, the State's population has nearly doubled.

Madam Chair, when something is plentiful, it is cheap. When it is scarce, it is expensive. NEPA is making everything we depend upon in our lives increasingly scarce, and therefore, increasingly expensive.

The left obsesses over a 1-degree rise in temperature over the next century, but they couldn't care less that they are making it impossible for people to heat their homes in subfreezing winters.

They promise us they care about the environment, but they couldn't care less that entire human communities' and species' habitats and millions of acres of forest are being laid to waste by preventable mega fires.

They obsess over the snail darter but couldn't care less that they have destroyed thousands of agricultural jobs,

idled a half million acres of California farmland, and sent grocery prices skyrocketing.

They promised us that NEPA would protect our forests. Instead, it is destroying them.

H.R. 1 begins to dial back the damage that NEPA has done, both to the environment and to the quality of life of all Americans, simply by reducing the time and cost required for these massive bureaucratic studies.

The question before us is whether our children will grow up in a world of scarcity, poverty, and misery or one of abundance, prosperity, and optimism.

That is the simple question before us. We choose prosperity; a future of abundant and affordable energy, water, food, lumber, minerals, and all the material comforts and benefits that flow from the resources our country has been blessed with.

That is something worthy to be remembered, and that future can begin with this vote today.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LANDSMAN).

Mr. LANDSMAN. Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1, a very unpopular and wholly unhelpful bill.

The debate on this bill has to be put in the context of two very important things: inflation and costs, including gas prices, but also this broken economy that many feel is rigged.

Both Democrats and Republicans in my district talk about this all the time. You see, there are those with power and wealth, and then there are the rest of us.

It seems like those who have the power and the wealth keep getting more and more, and the rest of us keep getting less and less.

We ask, why is this?

We ask ourselves how can gas prices go up while our bank accounts go down; yet oil companies see profits skyrocket?

□ 1515

How is that not a broken economy? It does beg the question: Is it rigged?

Now we arrive at this bill. Let's be clear, Americans don't want more giveaways furthering this imbalance. They want relief.

Many of us are proposing that relief in energy rebates—direct assistance to help Americans pay for gas and their heating bills.

H.R. 1 just furthers this imbalance. Instead of direct assistance for Americans, which Americans want, it is more giveaways for oil and gas companies. The oil and gas companies have said two things about this bill: one, it is not going to help us speed up the process; and two, thank you for all the giveaways. We love them.

They get more power, build up more wealth, and we get, one, no relief on prices; two, a bigger deficit to deal with; and, three, the loss of local control and input. We actually lose power.



The environmental impact study is where we as Americans weigh in. This bill is controversial and problematic because it takes more away from us and gives more and more and more to a few companies.

That is the broken economy. That is why people think this system is rigged. That is why my colleagues should vote “no.”

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN), another Member of the House Natural Resources Committee.

Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of this bill because this legislation will restore and secure American energy independence.

I am especially supportive of this bill's provisions to modernize the NEPA process. Look how long it takes for many of the permits to actually be approved. It streamlines the Federal permitting process for all industries. These commonsense reforms will provide the necessary certainty so projects across the Nation are carried out in a timely manner without sacrificing our environmental standards which are the most robust in the world.

This will be critical for jurisdictions like mine in Puerto Rico, as we rebuild our public and energy infrastructure from recent natural disasters. Modernizing NEPA and the Federal permitting process—setting clear and reasonable timelines for agencies to conduct environmental reviews—will help simplify the process and reduce bureaucratic hurdles that too often have delayed our recovery process.

This bill will also establish a revenue-sharing structure for offshore wind leases in Federal waters. I was proud to work with Chairman WESTERMAN during our committee markup to secure language clarifying that both coastal States and territories will receive revenues from any Federal offshore wind development off their coasts.

Specifically, this bill establishes a framework under which coastal States and territories will get funds for these offshore wind revenues. This bill further requires that States and territories invest these funds in coastal protection and resiliency projects, such as hurricane and flood protection, restoration, conservation, beach nourishment, and estuary management.

Therefore, this is not just an energy security and permitting reform package. This is also a coastal resiliency bill. For that reason, and knowing that we got billions of dollars in Federal funding for reconstructing the island, this is the process we need, this is the reform we actually need to get those funds in hand.

I thank and commend Majority Leader SCALISE, Chair WESTERMAN, Chair RODGERS and Chair GRAVES for their leadership and work on this important, powerful legislation.

I wish I could vote for this bill on the floor of the House today, but as a terri-

tory delegate I cannot, but I support this bill.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for her input on the bill and for her great ideas.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Chair, I wish to raise my voice against H.R. 1, this bill that has been given the moniker “polluters over people.” I think it is an appropriate moniker, and I will tell you why. It doesn't create energy independence any more than anything else we are doing in the energy sector. It doesn't save people money. This is money that will go into the pockets of Big Oil and big polluters.

We all saw during the pandemic when the price of oil per barrel leveled off, the price at the pump per gallon kept going up and up and up, and everybody who was filling up their gas tank and feeling like they needed to get an on-site mortgage to do it, knew where that money was going. It was going into the pockets of the oil companies.

You know what else it doesn't do? It doesn't save our government money. In fact, it costs our government money. \$400 million extra this will add to the annual deficit if we pass this bill, this polluters over people bill.

You know, the question is: Well, what does it do? Well, it does away, Madam Chair, with bedrock protections for the things that people count on the government protecting: clean air, clean water. It does away with the National Environmental Policy Act almost entirely, and it guts the Clean Water Act.

This is not what Americans signed up for for their government. In fact, there are statutes, there are protections that were put in place during Republican and Democratic administrations over the years. It has become things that Americans have learned to depend on, to count on, that the government is going to keep their air and their water clean for them. This takes that away. It eliminates it.

What else does it do? It is going to cost homeowners money. It takes away the electrification program that will give them rebates to redoing the electricity in their house.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Finally, what it does is it throws up the white flag in our war against climate change. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs in this country, General Milley, has identified climate change as a threat to national security, and he is right.

We are in a fight against climate change. This is not the time to throw up the white flag and run away from a fight. Americans don't do this. I say stick up for people over the polluters,

people over politics. Vote “no” on H.R. 1.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I find it ironic that a Member from Pennsylvania, where one of the largest deposits of natural gas in the world resides, would call the producers in Pennsylvania the polluters versus the ones in Russia and Saudi Arabia.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California, (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman, BRUCE WESTERMAN, for his work.

Madam Chair, the chairman mentioned something about our last speaker from Pennsylvania. I am a little concerned. Maybe he didn't have time to read the whole bill because the bill he described is not the bill that is before us.

He said somehow this would harm the environment. He was concerned about climate. If this bill passes, global emissions will be reduced. The chairman pointed out that the gentleman before, from the other side of the aisle, from Pennsylvania was criticizing this bill and he talked about the natural gas. I am not sure if the gentleman on the other side of the aisle has done any research or if he knows that American natural gas is 41 percent cleaner than Russian natural gas.

It is an interesting little fact. If we had replaced for 1 year just Russian natural gas to Europe, we would have reduced CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by more than 200 million tons.

So, Madam Chair, it really begs the question: Who is the polluter? Those who defend Russia and vote against this bill. It is interesting the people opposing this bill, those I am hearing on the other side of the aisle—China, Russia, and OPEC. It is interesting the friends you keep.

Now, let's talk a little bit about this. If you go across this country, Madam Chair, it costs too much to heat your home and fill up your car. It cost less an administration ago.

Today, more than one-third of all Americans say they have skipped buying food or medicine to pay an energy bill in the last 12 months. We are going to have opportunity this week to make sure that they don't have to do that again if you vote “yes.” This is neither affordable nor sustainable.

In response, President Biden has paid lip service to the need of more energy production, but this is a public relations stunt. Almost every one of his policies involves penalizing America and empowering China.

Now, here are the facts: For years, President Biden and Democrats have attacked energy producers, blocked new leases on Federal land, and ground the permitting process to a halt. Their so-called Inflation Reduction Act included a natural gas tax, a \$27 billion climate slush fund.

The gentleman on the other side of the aisle from Pennsylvania, he supported taxing the natural gas that is

produced in his State and creating a slush fund.

Meanwhile, in my home State of California, burdensome environmental laws have led to recurring blackouts and more red tape that raises costs for everything. Rather than increasing production and providing good-paying jobs, California imported more than half of its oil from Ecuador in recent years.

The interesting fact here is, when the Democrats took control of California under Governor Gavin Newsom, he reduced the amount of oil produced in California by 20 percent. That was 80,000 barrels a day. That doesn't mean California used 80,000 less barrels; it meant California started paying Putin for 50,000 barrels. They get the majority of their oil from Ecuador, from the Amazon.

Instead of producing it in an environmentally sound way in California, we are harming the environment. That is exactly what this bill is able to do—lower global emissions, lower the price of energy, and make the world more secure and safe, because then Putin and Russia is not controlling Europe.

Democrats have sent a clear message about their priorities. They are the party of \$5 gas, subsidizing Communist China and the never-ending dependence on foreign dictators for minerals we have in America.

It was only a few short years ago where America produced more of the critical minerals than China, but as the Democrats would shut down leases, make it harder to open new mines, they moved it to other parts of the world, and not in an environmentally sound way, but by empowering China, making them stronger, and making the price in America higher.

Luckily, Congress has the opportunity to change the behavior of Washington by passing the Lower Energy Costs Act. Every Member of this chamber should support it. I understand why Russia and China oppose lower energy costs for America and making America stronger, but I don't understand why Members in this Congress would stand with China and Russia against America.

The Lower Energy Costs Act does two important things: One, it restores American energy leadership by repealing unnecessary taxes and overregulation on American energy producers so we can lead the world in providing clean, affordable energy.

Two, it makes it easier to build things in America. For example, this bill includes a 2-year time limit on environmental impact statements. It also streamlines the process for lawsuits so that activists can't use the courts to delay projects for years.

Ninety years ago, American workers built the Empire State Building in 400 days. That is 13 months. These days, however, even repairing existing structures, just like Lake Isabella Dam in my district, has taken 18 years, and that was only because we were lucky in pushing for it.

That is exactly how the Big Government under the Biden administration wants the system to work. Every time we need a pipeline, a road, or a dam, it gets held up on an average of 5 to 7 years and adds millions of dollars in costs for the project to comply with Washington's permitting process.

□ 1530

It is too long. It is unaffordable. It is not based on science. It is holding us back. It is time we speed up the time it takes for us to build all kinds of things in America. We could streamline permitting, stop abusive lawsuits, protect the environment, and, importantly, lower the price of energy.

This is why the Lower Energy Costs Act is H.R. 1. It signals how important the bill truly is.

Madam Chair, when the Democrats were in the majority, do you know what their H.R. 1 bill was? Election. Why? They wanted to change the election law to try to guarantee their right to be reelected. You see, they looked after themselves.

When Republicans took the majority, our H.R. 1 is about lowering energy costs for all Americans. We think it is important to serve others, not yourself.

I get permitting reform isn't for everyone. If you like paying more at the pump, you don't want to make it faster for American workers to build more pipelines. If you are China, you would rather America sit back and let others lead. If you are a bureaucrat, maybe you really do enjoy reading the 600-page environmental impact studies.

The rest of America wants lower prices, more cash in their hands, more good-paying jobs in America, and rules that are good for the environment. That is exactly what the Lower Energy Costs Act does.

Madam Chair, America has the potential to become a true energy superpower. God has blessed us with abundant energy, and we shouldn't have to depend on other countries for our future. In fact, we should make the world dependent on us for energy. The world would be cleaner and safer, and America would be better off.

If you want to have a responsible energy policy where America produces more energy, pays less for a gallon of gas, and never again bows to foreign dictators, vote "yes" on the Lower Energy Costs Act.

Three things will happen when this bill becomes law.

Your energy costs will be reduced. You will have more cash to take care of your family, to pay for your medicine, to take your family on vacation.

It will reduce global emissions, so environmentally, the world will be a better place.

It will make the world a safer place, so no longer does America pay Putin for dirtier oil or gas, so no longer does China control other nations because they control the critical minerals that America will not produce. No longer

will we watch, as we watched in the 1930s, countries bound together to create an axis of power.

We have now watched China enter the Middle East to bring Saudi Arabia and Iran together. That used to be the role of the American President at Camp David. It is no longer.

We do not want to watch our President travel to the Middle East to beg to produce something more when America can produce it here in an environmentally sound way.

Madam Chair, I know why Russia and China fight this bill so hard. I do not understand why those on the other side of the aisle join with Russia and China. I ask them to join with Americans and make America safe and environmentally sound and the world a more secure place.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

When we were in the majority, Democrats, we passed H.R. 1. What was that about? It was not about elections. It was about our democracy. It was about protecting that democracy. After January 6, that became urgent.

Now, some might want to deny that—that was just a walk in the park, people taking a stroll. We were here. We knew what was going on, and the American people knew what was going on.

The issue of patriotism has been brought up. It is patriotic for us to oppose polluters over people. It is patriotic because we care and feel that the public health of the American people needs to be protected, that we have to deal with climate and the crisis that we are confronting.

To question the patriotism of those instincts is wrong, and we will continue to represent the American people on their most urgent needs. The future and their destinies shouldn't be turned over to Big Oil and Big Gas and the mining industry, for them to determine that future. They have to have a role, and our statutes and the protections that are in our laws need to be part of that role.

Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Chair, I thank the ranking member for the time because my residents are already hurting. H.R. 1 would devastate their lives even more.

Environmental impact statements change lives for the better, from air monitoring, pushing back against the corporate polluters that, again, just want to make a profit over the public health impact that would happen if we just gave them free rein.

This bill is nothing more than a cheap political stunt to pad the profits of the same greedy oil and gas companies that are price gouging our residents at the pump and poisoning the air they breathe and the water they drink.

These are the same oil companies that donated hundreds of thousands of

dollars to House Republicans and made nearly half a trillion dollars in profits last year alone.

Their servants across the aisle don't think that is enough. They want to gut our most important critical environmental and public health protections, leaving our communities at the mercy of corporate polluters that have shown time and time again they will sacrifice our lives, our public health, to make more money.

Make no mistake, this bill destroys the National Environmental Policy Act and the Clean Water Act. It guarantees there will be more oil spills. It guarantees more water crises, more deaths, and more suffering.

Once you get beyond the BS, the truth is clear. Health protections for you and your family aren't making gas expensive; corporate greed is.

The greedy oil and gas companies have gotten away with price gouging and stock buybacks that enrich their shareholders but make everything less affordable for our residents. They don't plan to stop because their greed is only enabled with bills like this.

The amazing thing about this, about colleagues trying to run leaky oil pipelines through our communities, is that the bill isn't even popular. The American people get it. They understand the urgency of the climate crisis, the importance of protecting our air, our water. They want the government and corporations to take serious action to make sure their lives are protected.

Yet, here we are, debating a bill that wraps climate denial and corporate giveaways into one tidy, toxic package as the world burns.

Our residents, my residents, are already struggling with health disparities. They deserve better. They deserve to breathe the clean air.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), another member of the House Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

America has an abundant supply of minerals, oil, and gas, and my State of Arizona ranks first among all States for non-fuel mineral resource production.

While the mining industry is still thriving in Arizona, primarily due to previously started mines, the Biden administration, and some in this very Chamber, have purposely slow-walked the permitting approval process, threatening this critically important industry.

H.R. 1 incentivizes domestic mineral production, unlocking resources that are vital for national security, renewable energy, and new technologies, like mineral processing, refinement, and concentration. This typically has been sent overseas to China, which then, in turn, monopolizes and holds these critical and rare resources ransom through supply chains.

Sadly, Arizona has two of the last three copper smelters in the United States, to which we hold to the highest environmental safety standards.

Allowing China to process these minerals is a continual slap in the face of the United States' stringent and responsible environmental laws.

Not surprisingly, it takes more than a decade, sometimes even two, to permit a mine in the United States. Canada can permit a mine in less than 3 years.

H.R. 1 modernizes the Federal regulations that delay projects for decades. H.R. 1 will help restore America as the global leader in energy technology development and protect Arizona's mining industry from the Biden administration and the leftists who want to shut it all down.

Madam Chair, I applaud Chairman WESTERMAN for his leadership, and I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1. The mantra should be: Now mined in America. Now refined in America. Now built in America.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), my good friend.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Chair, with this bill, our Republican colleagues offer their answer to our overheated planet, turn up the heat. And to those parents concerned about their children's future in what could become an uninhabitable planet, they say quite simply, "shut up and get out of the way."

This dirty bill will not bring our energy costs down, but it will drive our hospital bills and our doctor bills way up because it is a dirty deal.

Republican fossilized thinking threatens the health of millions of Americans and endangers the future of our planet.

Our country should be the world's leader in combating the climate crisis and growing the many new jobs that are necessary to develop the new technologies to combat the ravages of an overheated planet. But instead, the Republicans surrender the green technology leadership to China and other countries around the world.

Protecting American families from the climate crisis should be a bipartisan issue, but it has increasingly become one as most of our Republican colleagues ignore the dangers and remain beholden to polluters over people.

Last year, we made some modest progress under Democratic leadership. We offered incentives for both businesses and families to come together to slow carbon pollution, to go electric, to improve energy efficiency, and to develop additional renewable energy resources.

Instead of adding to that progress, which we need, Republicans today would drag our country back to the disastrous years of their hero, Donald Trump, who abandoned American leadership in favor of more and more pollution.

Only this month, the world's scientists have told us once again: "There

is a rapidly closing window of opportunity to secure a livable and sustainable future for all." Republicans want to slam that very window shut.

As the U.N. Secretary General declared: "Humanity is on thin ice, and that ice is melting fast. Our world needs climate action on all fronts, everything, everywhere, all at once."

This bill doesn't deserve its designation as H.R. 1. It is not even H.R. 0 because it drags us backward into a world in which our grandchildren will not be able to safely reside.

And even for those who won't listen to the scientists and the world leaders near unanimous view on this, all they need to do is just open their eyes. The extreme weather that we see, the intensified heat, the mega-droughts, the ice storms, the tornadoes and hurricanes, and heat, heat, and more heat in places that it has never occurred before, threatening food production and human health. All of this, along with the threat of tropical diseases appearing in places like Central Texas where they have never occurred before.

The climate crisis is already taking lives, and it will take many, many more the longer we are delayed by outrageous tactics like we see here today.

This sorry bill will never become law, but every day that Republicans dither, delay, and distract us; every day they feed the ignorance about the climate crisis, the nearer we come to a tipping point from which we can never recover.

I am voting "no" because, left unchecked, Republican half-baked ideas will burn up our planet.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The ideas of the Republican Party will do more to reduce global carbon emissions than anything that the Democrats have proposed, especially the legislation they passed in the last Congress that is actually incentivizing foreign production of energy.

I remember distinctly President Biden going over and fist-bumping the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia. Then, this year, guess what? Saudi Arabia's state-owned oil company reported the highest profits ever—\$161 billion, for an oil company.

□ 1545

They are the plans that we are putting in place, H.R. 1, that will help the planet. It is not the continued misguided principles that are putting the real polluters, the global polluters, ahead of the people.

It is ironic that a Member from Texas would think that producers in Saudi Arabia and Russia and Venezuela are polluting less than the oil producers and the energy producers in the State of Texas.

Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE).

Mr. ROSENDALE. Madam Chair, as I travel across Montana and meet with constituents, I hear the same thing.

They want our Federal Government to remove the barriers that lead to incredibly high energy costs that they face to operate their farms, their businesses, and their homes.

A lot of politicians here in Washington don't understand these struggles. They don't understand that their policies, which caused diesel prices to go up, dramatically increase input costs for farmers. They haven't had to endure a Montana winter where temps can hover between 10 and 20 degrees below zero for extended periods of time. The Energy Information Administration estimated that it cost Montanans 30 percent more to heat their homes last year, thanks to the Biden administration's policies. That is not pocket change.

Lowering energy costs and restoring our Nation's energy dominance will require an all-of-the-above approach and a dismantling of the Biden administration's green energy policies. That is why H.R. 1 is such a comprehensive reform bill, with input from representatives from every part of our Nation.

Since Biden entered office, his administration has held zero lease sales for energy development on public lands. That is why I reintroduced the Restore Onshore Energy Act to be included in this package. It would force the administration to immediately resume quarterly lease sales dictated in the Mineral Leasing Act and further require the Department of the Interior to immediately hold replacement sales when the sales are missed.

In addition to resuming lease sales, H.R. 1 will repeal harmful royalty and fee increases, streamline the Federal permitting process under NEPA, and require more transparency from the Federal Government, among many other provisions. This is about cutting through bureaucracy and fighting the radical environmentalists to allow our energy sector to get back to work for the American people.

We know that energy independence isn't just a critical component of our national security and supply chain, but it also affects agriculture, the largest industry in Montana. The President's policies caused a 150 percent increase in transportation diesel prices since he took office. This directly contributes to market access, complications for farmers and ranchers, and increases inputs, like fertilizers and pesticides and labor and many other things. All of this results in higher food costs at the grocery store and a decrease in revenue margins for agricultural producers.

In the words of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, farming looks mighty easy when you use a pencil for a plow and you live a thousand miles away from a cornfield.

It is time for Congress to stand up to unelected bureaucrats and the radical environmentalists controlling our executive branch and setting policies without regard to the impact that they will have on the people in Montana and real America.

Madam Chair, I support H.R. 1 and hope my colleagues will do the same.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, the Republicans claim that they will do more to reduce emissions with this legislation than Democrats have done. I remind everyone that this legislation, the House Republican H.R. 1, has no emission reduction targets and the push is to increase fossil fuel production, which is the highest source that contributes to the climate crisis that we are facing now.

Madam Chair, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), a member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1.

As one of the few Members who serves on both the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Natural Resources, I have seen almost every version of this package as it was crafted. Hearing after hearing and markup after markup, it has been clear. I love my Republican colleagues, but they are more focused on advancing partisan bills that will benefit the oil, gas, and mining industries while selling out landmark environmental laws in the name of permitting reform, instead of advancing meaningful, bipartisan solutions for the American people that will help us achieve our climate goals and solidify our energy security for future generations.

For months now, my Republican colleagues have called for policies and permitting reforms in Congress that would strengthen our energy security. I have consistently been willing to work with my colleagues—and still want to—in this pursuit, but what we have here is not reform.

Gutting the National Environmental Policy Act, otherwise known as NEPA, is not permitting reform.

Weakening enforcement under the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, and other critical public health laws is not permitting reform.

Granting mining companies the ability to take minerals from public lands without paying a dime to taxpayers in royalties or helping clean up these toxic sites afterward is not permitting reform.

Forcing Federal agencies to hold oil and gas sales on public lands, even if they are not needed, is not permitting reform.

Repealing the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, a \$27 billion program, that I admit I helped author, to deploy clean energy projects nationwide and cut greenhouse gas pollution, is not permitting reform and will not strengthen our energy security in any meaningful way.

To my Republican colleagues who continue to refuse to believe the science or to acknowledge we are facing an existential threat from the climate crisis, just read the United Nations' most recent IPCC report from 2022.

This legislation instead puts polluters, profits, and pollution over the American people. It is that simple.

In order to truly attain meaningful energy independence here at home, we need a net zero energy economy built on solar, wind, hydropower, batteries, electric vehicles, and even nuclear.

What we cannot do is expect more drilling for oil and gas to solve all of our current and future energy woes. I do understand bad weather. The last four weekends, I have had snow and ice, and I have lost my electricity every single weekend.

Listen, we are at the beginning of a transformational shift toward a clean energy economy, a shift that has now accelerated due to the historic investments and legislation Democrats and the Biden-Harris administration were able to enact into law over the last 2 years.

This transition will likely present the greatest permitting challenge in generations. However, we must permit and build in ways that do not harm communities or our environment.

That is why Democrats enacted historic legislation last Congress, the Inflation Reduction Act, that directed over a billion-dollar investment to increase staffing and resources across Federal agencies for conducting efficient and effective environmental reviews and permitting.

The bill today doesn't have real solutions to high energy costs, and it is going to drive up the deficit, not according to Democrats, but according to the independent Congressional Budget Office.

I am pragmatic and I am seasoned enough to know we have a lot of work ahead. If we can do it collectively, Republicans and Democrats, it can serve as an important tool to combat climate change, strengthen our economy, and protect our national security.

But again, let me be clear: We must not entertain proposals that roll back landmark environmental laws across the board, including NEPA, so we can line the pockets of Big Oil.

As I mentioned at committee, when John Dingell and Senator "Scoop" Jackson originally authored and advanced the National Environmental Policy Act, it was done thoughtfully, through a meaningful legislative process, to build broad and bipartisan support. This is the process that we need.

We can't gut NEPA. It was brought about to include community and to care about the economy. We have got to work together. I remain open to working with my Republican colleagues on bipartisan energy security and permitting reform efforts. I hope we can. My colleague, the chairman, knows I want to, but I still do not see this legislative package as a serious proposal.

I don't want to be dependent on China more than anybody else does for our batteries, or Russia or any other country. We need to do it in the good ol' USA. We can do it with ingenuity, innovation, technology, and protect our environment at the same time.

Madam Chair, I am strongly opposed, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally to receive a message.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska) assumed the chair.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Kaitlyn Roberts, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

#### LOWER ENERGY COSTS ACT

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CARL), another member of the House Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. CARL. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

I did not bring any fancy charts. I don't have any nice pictures for you to look at. But what I do want you to look through is my heart and my mind.

In 64 years of living, I have spent the last 2 years working with the other side of the aisle, watching them systematically take this country apart when it comes to our natural resources. Enough is enough.

You want me to prove it?

We just won the House. We have the majority now. We have a chance to change what is going on today.

Let me tell you what is going on. All we hear is: The sky is falling. The sky is falling.

I encourage people to get out from wherever you are hiding and look around, smell the fresh air, look at the sun shining. It is not falling.

It is like dealing with a bunch of guys practicing magic. They want you to watch one hand while they are picking your pocket with the other hand. I have had enough. I have had enough, and I think it is time we talk about it.

They have systematically shut down our copper mine, the largest copper mine on the North American Continent and in the world, so I understand. They have shut it down.

Who are we buying copper from now? China, a communist country we are buying all that copper from.

Excuse me. I have got a problem with that.

I look at my oil refineries and my gas refineries down in Alabama and outside of Alabama.

Those gas refineries, do you know what they are refining?

Venezuelan oil. Not American oil. Venezuelan oil from a communist country.

Is there a pattern here that we should be looking at? Is there a pattern of a communist regime here that we just keep getting pushed on us?

I just spent 2 weeks in Central America trying to figure out how we can keep a communist country from taking

over Central America. But we have this side of the aisle that wants to tell us the sky is falling. I refuse to believe it, and I refuse to give it up.

Voters made their voice heard last November when they sent Republicans to Congress to put an end to Democrats' anti-American agenda.

Americans are paying 40 percent more for their gas since President Biden took office, and the Democrats have done nothing but add fuel to the fire to raise that price by shutting down our drilling and shutting down our mines.

On the other hand, House Republicans this week are moving forward with the Lower Energy Costs Act, this act, which has two primary objectives here: Increasing American energy production—not communist—and to strip away the rules and regulations that make it harder for American infrastructure to grow this economy.

□ 1600

I am especially proud of this bill because I worked on part of it. The Unleashing American Energy Act is included in this package. My bill fights back on the Biden administration's war on our domestic energy production by mandating oil and gas lease sales each year in the Gulf of Mexico and off the coast of Alaska.

Let me remind my friends, most of these are union jobs. Unions are supporting you. Remember that. These are union jobs you are voting against.

House Republicans have a solution right here in this lower energy costs bill. I encourage all of my friends to vote on this bill. This bill will help end our reliance on these foreign countries—these foreign Communist countries. We need to reflect on that as we vote.

Madam Chair, if you support the Communist Party, vote "no" on this bill. If you support American jobs and if you support American families, vote "yes" on H.R. 1.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, if you believe in climate change and the climate crisis, vote "no" on this legislation. If you believe that regardless of ideology, if you believe that climate change is real and must be dealt with, vote "no" on this legislation because it does nothing to deal with that real threat in front of us.

Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. CROCKETT).

Ms. CROCKETT. Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition of H.R. 1, the misleadingly named Lower Energy Costs Act.

I had everything written down of what I was going to say, but then I started hearing some other stuff. I decided that what I wanted to talk about is a few things.

Number one: I need the American people to understand that H.R. 1 means that this is the first bill. This is the bill that the party in power thinks matters most. This is where their pri-

orities lie. When you look at what the Democrats did, they decided that they wanted to stand for democracy after there were those that wanted to try to tear our democracy apart.

I have to rest here for a second, simply because at the time I was a Texas House Representative who had to flee my State because of voting rights. I urged this House to pass H.R. 1, simply because we were trying to make sure that people would not cheat in these elections.

Just because you have control of the House doesn't mean that you didn't take your time and gerrymander these lines because we know that is exactly what happened. That is the only reason that the Democrats are not currently in control. The reason that this margin is so tight is because our policies stand for the people.

Let's talk about this bill. This bill is about putting people over polluters. If we want to talk about what the Republicans do when they are in control and they get to decide about power, let's talk about the State of Texas.

Let's talk about the fact that we have left the State of Texas in the dark over and over. It was interesting to look across the aisle and see a sign that said that the Republicans will keep the lights on. Well, go talk to Texas and find out if the lights have been kept on or if we have been left in the dark.

We are consistently left in the dark because there is this idea that if we just go ahead and get rid of regulations that everything will work out. Unfortunately, it has not worked out. It has not worked out to the tune of us actually losing lives in the State of Texas.

That is why we are here standing before you, making sure that we are fighting for actual lower bills when it comes to our everyday working families that are already squeezed by inflation.

We heard Mr. Speaker talk about the fact that he wanted to make sure there was more money in people's pockets for medicine. When it came down to voting for the Inflation Reduction Act, I don't believe that there were too many Republicans that were voting for that—to make sure we could lower the cost of insulin—just to make sure that the RECORD is clear—if we want to make sure we are putting more money into their pockets.

House Republicans want to lower energy costs for big polluters, plain and simple. That means somebody foots the bill and somebody pays the price. Once again, go ask my constituents in Texas. We are the ones who are footing the bill for the failures of our grid over and over and over.

My constituents tend to be Black and Brown, mostly, and they tend to be those that are disproportionately living in polluted communities today, that are only able to breathe because of the scant environmental protections we actually have. They are being asked